

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT  
OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

NO. 04-4695

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JAMES HILTON AYODEJI  
Appellant

---

On Appeal From the United States  
District Court  
For the Middle District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. Crim. Action No. 04-cr-00058)  
District Judge: Hon. Sylvia H. Rambo

---

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)  
January 17, 2007

BEFORE: McKEE, AMBRO, and STAPLETON,  
Circuit Judges

(Opinion Filed January 26, 2007 )

---

---

OPINION OF THE COURT

---

STAPLETON, Circuit Judge:

Appellant, James Hilton Ayodeji, is the subject of a final order of removal. A jury found him guilty of hindering his removal from the United States in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(1)(C) and of making a false statement in a matter within the jurisdiction of the government of the United States in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2). These charges arose out of Ayodeji's refusal to provide information necessary to the execution of the order of removal and his continued insistence that he is Ernest E. Grayson, an individual who was born in Greenville, South Carolina, on September 3, 1963, and whose Social Security Number is 072-54-5918.

Appellant's counsel has filed an *Anders* brief. *See Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967).

We have reviewed the record, and we agree with counsel for the government and the appellant that there are no non-frivolous issues presented by this appeal. The government presented ample evidence to support the jury's conclusion that Ayodeji is not Ernest E. Grayson and that he had hindered his removal by refusing to supply information and fingerprints necessary to secure valid travel documents. We perceive no trial or sentencing errors.

We are satisfied that Ayodeji's counsel has adequately fulfilled the requirements of Rule 109.2, and his motion to withdraw will be granted. The issues presented in this appeal lack legal merit and thus do not require the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court.

The judgment of the District Court will be affirmed.